



March 19, 2001

Mr. Scott A. Kelly  
Deputy General Counsel  
Texas A&M University System  
301 Tarrow, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2001-1041

Dear Mr. Kelly:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 145043.

Texas A&M University (the "university") received a request for any information regarding an incident in which an individual was allegedly injured while riding in an elevator on university property, to include reports, repair summaries and/or insurance information. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103(a) excepts from disclosure information relating to litigation to which a governmental body is or may be a party. The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. In order to meet this burden, the governmental body must show that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Section 552.103 requires concrete evidence that litigation may ensue. To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must furnish evidence that litigation is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be

determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). A governmental body may establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated by showing that 1) it has received a claim letter from an allegedly injured party or his attorney and 2) the governmental body states that the letter complies with the notice of claim provisions of the Texas Tort Claims Act (TTCA) or applicable municipal statute or ordinance. Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996).

You assert to this office that the request letter received by the university from the attorney representing the party making a claim for injuries complies with the notice requirements of the TTCA. We therefore conclude that you have established that litigation is reasonably anticipated in this matter. Upon review of the submitted information, we conclude that it is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103, and therefore, it may be withheld from the requestor, with the following exception.

The Seventy-sixth Legislature amended section 552.022 of the Government Code to make certain information expressly public, and therefore not subject to discretionary exceptions to disclosure. Section 552.022 now states in relevant part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and are not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law.

Gov't Code § 552.022. One such category of expressly public information under section 552.022 is "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by [s]ection 552.108 . . . ." Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains several completed reports made for the university. Therefore, as prescribed by section 552.022, the completed reports must be released to the requestor unless they are confidential under other law.

You argue that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. Section 552.103 is a discretionary exception and not "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, we know of no other law that would make the completed reports confidential. Accordingly, the university must release the completed reports, which

---

<sup>1</sup>Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege, section 552.107(1)), 592 at 8 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104, information relating to competition or bidding), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Discretionary exceptions therefore do not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential.

we have marked with green tags, under section 552.022(a)(1). The university may withhold the remainder of the requested information under section 552.103.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. We also note that the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael A. Pearle".

Michael A. Pearle  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAP/seg

Ref: ID# 145043

Encl. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Scott F. DeShazo  
Herman, Howry & Breen  
1900 Pearl Street  
Austin, Texas 78705-5408  
(w/o enclosures)